REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated September 29, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Goldman et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,235) in view of *Civanlar et al.* (Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0024945). Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Goldman et al.* nor *Civanlar et al.*, alone or in combination, anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention for the reasons given below.

Goldman et al. disclose a system and method for bridging the POTS network and a packet network, such as the Internet, using a set of access objects that provide the interfacing and functionality for exchanging address and payload information with the packet network, and for exchanging payload information with the payload subnetwork and signaling information with the signaling subnetwork of the POTS network. The system and method disclosed by *Goldman et al.*, however, do not have a switch that distinguishes between voice and data payloads for routing traffic on different voice and data paths. Instead, in the system and method of *Goldman et al.*, all payload traffic (regardless of whether such payload traffic contains voice or data information) is routed between the POTS network and the packet network via a **single** common POTS/packet bridge. *See, e.g.,* FIG. 1 of the *Goldman et al.* reference.

Civanlar et al. disclose a WAN-based gateway that provides "conversion of the transmission format, control, call signaling and audio stream (and potentially video and data streams) between different transmission standards." Page 2, Paragraph 12. The differing transmission standards include a telephony network, an ATM/FR network, and the Internet. Page 2, Paragraph 23. The WAN-based gateway of *Civanlar et al.*, however, does not have a switch that distinguishes between voice and data signals for routing traffic on different voice and data

paths. Instead, *Civanlar et al.* tie all communications, regardless of whether they contain voice or data signals, to a **single** gateway that simply performs conversions from one transmission standard to another. Like *Goldman et al.*, *Civanlar et al.* use only a single path for handling voice and data signals.

In contrast, the presently claimed invention recites a method and system architecture for a central office that utilizes **separate** devices (i.e., a telephony gateway and a remote access server) and **separate** pathways to convert voice and data (e.g., modem) signals/calls into IP packets (and vice versa). In the presently claimed invention, the central office switch differentiates between voice and data calls, and routes such calls to the appropriate conversion device (i.e., the telephony gateway or the remote access server) based on whether the calls contain voice or data information. Consequently, neither *Goldman et al.* and their single common POTS/packet bridge, nor *Civanlar et al.* and their single gateway converter, anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention, alone or in combination.

As set forth above, *Civanlar et al.* do not disclose "a switch (100 of fig. 2) which differentiates between voice signals and data signals" and routes the signals to the appropriate conversion device (i.e., telephony gateway or remote access server), as represented by the Examiner. Even if *Civanlar et al.* did disclose such a switch, however, it would be improper to combine *Civanlar et al.* and *Goldman et al.* under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Indeed, such a combination would impermissibly render the system of *Goldman et al.* incapable of performing its intended function of bridging the POTS network and a packet network. To perform this bridging, *Goldman et al.* require the use of a set of access objects that provides the interfacing and functionality for exchanging address and payload information with the packet network, and for

- 3 -

exchanging payload information with the payload subnetwork and signaling information with the signaling subnetwork of the POTS network. Not only does the set of access objects disclosed by *Goldman et al.* function independent of whether its payload traffic contains voice or data information, its requires that all payload traffic (whether voice or data) between the POTS network and the packet network pass through the set of access objects (and not on some other path or through some other device). Consequently, there is no teaching or suggestion, and there can be no motivation, to modify *Goldman et al.* by combining *Goldman et al.* with *Civanlar et al.* as the Examiner has proposed.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants also believe the present claims to be in condition for allowance, and earnestly request early notification of same.

If, for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application on the basis of this response, and feels that a telephone conference would help clear up any unresolved matters, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF

Dated: 2-24-04

Sean M. Sullivan
Reg. No. 40,191

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF
300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3200
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone No. 312-913-0001; Facsimile No. 312-913-0002